## REMARKS

The Applicants thank Examiners Muktesh Gupta and Yemane Meslin very much for the
courtesy extended in the interview held by telephone on 18 February 2010.

Claims 1 to 20 are pending. The Office Action rejected independent claims 1 and 11 as being
anticipated by Matters et al. (US 2003/0208531).

In the interview, the Applicants' agent, Gavin Manning, pointed out that Matters et al., as
understood, does not disclose a full-duplex packetized interconnect directly connecting a CPU
and a network interface in a compute node. The Applicants understand that the Examiners
agree that this is the case and that the Examiners agree that Matters et al. does not anticipate
either of independent claims 1 and 11.

As discussed, claim 1 recites a method comprising "placing the data on a full-
duplex packetized interconnect directly connecting a CPU of the
first compute node to a first network interface of the first
compute node ...".

Claim 11 recites "a dedicated full-duplex packetized interconnect
directly coupling the CPU to the first network interface ...".

The Applicants note that Franke (US 6542513), as understood, which is cited in relation to
dependent claims 6-7 and 13-14, does not remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Matters et al.

As the Office Action raises no other issues with claims 1 and 11, claims 1 and 11 and their
dependent claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully
request that the rejection of claims 1 to 20 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance.  The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application.


Respectfully submitted,


By:      /GavinNManning/
         Gavin N. Manning
         Registration No. 36,412
         tel:         604.669.3432 ext. 9043
         fax:         604.681.4081
         e-mail:      GNMDocket@patentable.com